



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/065,655	11/07/2002	Wei Li	IACP0020USA	7998
27765	7590	06/24/2005	EXAMINER	
NORTH AMERICA INTERNATIONAL PATENT OFFICE (NAIPC) P.O. BOX 506 MERRIFIELD, VA 22116			CAI, WAYNE HUU	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2681	

DATE MAILED: 06/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/065,655

Applicant(s)

LI ET AL.

Examiner

Wayne Cai

Art Unit

2681

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 May 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 8-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 8-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 05/06/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In claim 1, the Applicants assert that the claim recites "checking a character to determine if the character-encoding rule of the checked character is the second character-encoding rule. If the character-encoding rule of the checked character is the second character-encoding rule, no characters are transformed to another encoding rule."

Firstly, Chien does teach checking a character to determine if the character-encoding rule of the checked character is the second character-encoding rule (fig. 4, box 401) because this limitation of the claimed invention simply means that one character in the document needs to be checked whether it is a first or a second character-encoding rule. Chien's disclosure surely reads on the claim because it recognizes the character types whether it is a traditional/simplified Chinese character.

Secondly, the assertion of "If the character-encoding rule of the checked character is the second character-encoding rule, no characters are transformed to another encoding rule." is not in the claimed invention.

In response to arguments of claim 8, the Examiner again disagrees with the argument because the recited claim 8 simply means that the second rule is in Unicode format. Furthermore, it is also obvious to one skill in the art to select one type of

characters and do the conversion between one and another (i.e. converse between Unicode and GB or vice versa).

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 has been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-5, and 9-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kraft et al (hereinafter Kraft) (US – 6,487,424 B1) in view of Chien (US – 6,393,445 B1).

Regarding claim 1, Kraft discloses a character transcoding method for transforming characters encoded with a first character-encoding rule when input into a mobile phone, to characters encoded with a second character-encoding rule, the method comprising the following steps:

(a) Inputting a document into the mobile phone, wherein the document comprises at least one character (fig.3 and its descriptions);

Kraft, however, does not disclose:

- (b) Checking a character-encoding rule of at least one character in the document;
- (c) Transforming all the characters of the document to characters encoded with the second character-encoding rule when the character-encoding rule of at least one character in the document is the first character-encoding rule;
- (d) Outputting the characters of the document when the character-encoding rule of at least one character in the document is the second character-encoding rule.

In a similar endeavor, Chien discloses a system for transforming Chinese character. Chien also discloses:

- (b) Checking a character-encoding rule of at least one character in the document to determine whether the character-encoding rule of the checked character is the second character-encoding rule (fig.4, step 401; the Examiner also notes that this step is reasonably interpreted as whether that one character in the document is in the first or second character-encoding rule.)
- (c) Transforming all the characters of the document to characters encoded with the second character-encoding rule when the character-encoding rule of at least one character in the document is the first character-encoding rule (fig.4, steps 402 & 403);
- (d) Outputting the characters of the document when the character-encoding rule of at least one character in the document is the second character-encoding rule (fig.4, step 404).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to check and transform all characters to the second character-encoding rule so that the messages could be displayed in the desired format.

Regarding claim 2, Kraft and Chien disclose the method of claim 1 as described above. Chien also discloses, wherein the device comprises a checking module (the “recognizing means” is interpreted as a checking module), in step (b) the character-encoding rule of at least one character in the document being checked by the checking module (fig.4, step 401 and its descriptions).

Regarding claim 3, Kraft and Chien disclose the method of claim 1 as described above. Chien also discloses, wherein the device comprises a character encoding rule reference table, in step (c) the characters in the document being transformed to characters encoded with the second character-encoding rule according to the character-encoding rule reference table (column 4, lines 1-51).

Regarding claim 4, Kraft and Chien disclose the method of claim 1 as described above. Chien also discloses, wherein the device comprises a character encoding transforming module (fig.3, “switching means”), in step (c) all the characters in the document being transformed to characters encoded with the second character-encoding rule by the character encoding transforming module (fig.4, step 403).

Regarding claim 5, Kraft and Chien disclose the method of claim 1 as described above. Chien also discloses, wherein the first character-encoding rule is a Big-5 encoding rule for Chinese characters (column 1, lines 16-30 and fig.1).

Regarding claim 9, Kraft and Chien disclose the method of claim 1 as described above. Kraft discloses, wherein the mobile phone comprises a display for displaying the Chinese characters (fig.6), and Chien discloses a display (fig.5) for displaying the transformed characters encoded with the second character-encoding rule.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Chien's display with Kraft's mobile phone display for displaying the transformed characters encoded with the second character-encoding rule because the desired information could be displayed on the portable device.

Regarding claim 10, Kraft and Chien disclose the method of claim 9 as described above. Kraft also discloses, wherein the display is a liquid crystal display (fig.2, elements 3 & 13, and its descriptions).

Regarding claim 11, Kraft and Chien disclose the method of claim 1 as described above. Kraft also discloses, wherein the document is an electronic mail (column 6, lines 30-36).

Regarding claim 12, Kraft and Chien disclose the method of claim 1 as described above. Kraft also discloses, wherein the document is a short message for a short message service (SMS) (column 6, lines 30-36).

Regarding claim 13, Kraft and Chien disclose the method of claim 1 as described above. Kraft also discloses, wherein the mobile phone comprises a plurality of pushbuttons (fig.1 and its descriptions), in step (a) the document being inputted into the mobile phone through the pushbuttons (column 5, line 66 – column 6, line 6).

Regarding claim 14, Kraft and Chien disclose the method of claim 1 as described above. Kraft discloses the following step of users enters a short message (column 6, lines 30 – 56). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include in step (a), inputting the document through wireless communications since it was well known in the art that the SMS is wirelessly transmitted.

Regarding claim 15, Kraft and Chien disclose the method of claim 1 as described above. Chien discloses a performing step (c) above. Chien does not disclose the step of transmitting the document encoded with the second character-encoding rule to another mobile phone through wireless communications. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Kraft's method of entering the SMS on the mobile phone with Chien's method of transforming all characters to the second-encoding rule so that the message being sent is in the desired format and read by another end-user.

5. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kraft in view of Chien, and in further view of Atkin et al (hereinafter Atkin) (US – 6,393,416 B1).

Regarding claim 8, Kraft and Chien disclose the method of claim 1 as described above. Kraft and Chien, however, fail to disclose the second character-encoding rule is a Unicode encoding rule.

In a similar endeavor, Atkin discloses a method for entering bidirectional or double byte character set languages. Atkin also discloses, wherein the second character-encoding rule is a Unicode encoding rule (abstract, column 1, lines 33-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Unicode as the second character-encoding rule because it is a universal encoding standard that could be used by all users.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2681

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wayne Cai whose telephone number is (571) 272-7798. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday; 9:00-6:00; alternating Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild can be reached on (571) 272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Wayne Cai
Examiner
Art Unit 2681


ERIKA A. GARTY
PRIMARY EXAMINER